

September 13, 2023

**VIA ECF**

Honorable Pamela K. Chen  
United States District Judge  
United States District Court, Eastern District of New York  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn, New York 11201

**Re: *Freeman, et al. v. HSBC Holdings plc, et al.*, 14-cv-6601 (PKC)(CLP) (“*Freeman I*”)  
*Freeman, et al. v. HSBC Holdings plc, et al.*, 18-cv-7359 (PKC)(CLP) (“*Freeman II*”)  
*Stephens, et al. v. HSBC Holdings plc, et al.*, 18-cv-7439 (PKC)(CLP) (“*Stephens*”)**

**Letter Motion Requesting Postponement of Deadlines in June 28, 2023,  
Minute Order**

Dear Judge Chen:

Plaintiffs respectfully request a 21-day postponement of the deadlines set forth in the Court’s June 28, 2023, Minute Order pending a decision by this Court on their Letter Motion Requesting “Constructive” Discovery, or a decision by the court in *Bartlett, et al., v. Société Générale de Banque au Liban SAL, et al.*, No. 19-cv-7 (CBA)(TAM), on the pending Motion for Leave to Use Discovery in Another Action, *see Bartlett*, ECF No. 335.

This is Plaintiffs’ first request for an extension of these deadlines. Defendants’ counsel object to this request.

As described by Plaintiffs in their motions pending before this Court and the court in *Bartlett*, they are requesting leave for the *Freeman II* and *Stephens* Plaintiffs to use records already produced by non-party KBC Bank and Defendant Standard Chartered Bank in their amended complaints in the above-referenced cases. The *Freeman I* Plaintiffs also anticipate using those records in their amended complaint if their motion to vacate is granted. The postponement is necessitated by the fact that Magistrate Judge Merkl has not yet addressed the motion for equivalent relief in *Bartlett* and the deadline for filing the amended complaints is currently September 26, 2023.

Mr. Hanchet, counsel for the HSBC defendants, anticipated the possibility of delay during the June 28, 2023, conference when he noted: “It’s not inconceivable to me that [Plaintiffs] would not be able to obtain those materials within 90 days or maybe, I don’t know, but that’s just one variable in all of this that I think the Court should factor in.” Tr. 40:10-13. The Court noted that delay may necessitate “adjust[ing] the schedule period.” *Id.* at 14-25, 41:1.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs request a postponement of those deadlines (and a postponement of the other deadlines reflected in the June 28, 2023, Minute Order) for a date 21 days after the issues raised herein are definitively resolved either by this Court or the court in *Barlett*.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gary M. Osen

cc: Magistrate Judge Merkl  
All counsel